

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Report on India and the East

Moderator, JOHN MacVANE

Speaker

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Interrogators:

SIRDAR SINGH

JAMES MICHENER



—COMING—

—September 15, 1953—

Our American Freedoms—1787-1953

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 19, NUMBER 19



\$5.00 A YEAR, 25c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOLUME 19

No. 19



Report on India and the East



The Broadcast of September 8, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the ABC Studios, 39 W. 66th Street, New York City, N. Y.



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT—recently returned from a tour around the world; author of *India and the Awakening East*. Active throughout her life in political and social affairs, Anna Eleanor Roosevelt (Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt) is most recently identified with the National Issues Committee of which she is first chairman. This non-partisan committee was organized last spring to increase the American people's awareness of critical world problems. Formerly (in 1945) she was appointed United States representative to the U.N. General Assembly and also was chairman of the commission on human rights of the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

Mrs. Roosevelt was born in New York City in 1884 and was married to the late President Franklin Roosevelt in 1905. Always taking a keen interest in politics, she served as finance chairman of the woman's activities in the Democratic National Campaign of 1928. From 1941-42 she was Assistant Director of the Office of Civilian Defense. Mrs. Roosevelt's writing activities have been an integral part of her busy life. In addition to a regular newspaper column, she is the author of *It's Up to the Women*, *This is My Story, My Days, If You Ask Me*, and *This I Remember*, among other books.

Interrogator—JAMES A. MICHENER—Pulitzer Prize Winner, author of *The Bridges of Toko-Ri* (1953) and *The Voice of Asia*. James A. Michener, author of 1947 Pulitzer Prize winning novel *Tales of the South Pacific*, and the new novel, *The Bridges of Toko-Ri*, comes of Quaker-farmer stock. Born in New York City on 1907, he grew up in Doylestown, Pa., where his mother sustained the family by boarding orphan children from Philadelphia. He left home at fourteen and "bummed" his way cross country. These early hobo-like years gave him a fine appreciation of America, and during this period he worked as a sports columnist at fifteen, an amusement park spotter during the summer months, and an actor on the Chautauqua circuit.

(Continued on page 14)

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); six weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 25c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Report on India and the East

Moderator MacVane:

Kipling wrote, "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet." Yet the Asian world that Kipling knew only a generation ago has gone and in its place is a new world east of Suez which meets the West at every turn and whose influence upon our own future must inevitably be tremendous. Even ten years ago, Europe controlled and governed most of Asia. Then the flame of a new nationalism brought by men of the East educated in the West caused the sleeping giant to stir, and from that day forward Asia's destiny lay in its own hands, whether for good or ill. Israel, Syria, Lebanon, India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippine Republic, this is only a partial list of the newly independent lands, countries which never before knew real independence.

Now in a single bound they have leaped into the field of international responsibility and into the twentieth century. The complex paradoxes that confront us in Asia are part of the fascination—highly cultivated and educated minds, the equal of any in the world, against blind ignorance. Extreme riches, extreme poverty; great power, equally great weakness; lofty spiritual values, sickening prejudice. But like it, dislike it, enthralled or baffled, the West must nevertheless try to understand what is happening in the area from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

The world is too small now, and care for our own survival forbids us to ignore Asia. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt went to see these countries for herself, after the UN General Assembly ended in Paris last year. Her latest book, *India and the Awakening East*, is her

record of the people she talked to, the impressions she gained. The ideas of the East had first been impressed upon her in the Social and Humanitarian Committee of the UN Assembly and in her contacts with Asian statesmen at the UN Commission on Human Rights.

To question Mrs. Roosevelt tonight we have two gentlemen with a wide knowledge of India and the East. Sirdar J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America, was born in India, educated there and in London. He is a lecturer and an author and has for a long time been foremost in organizing support for India in the United States. He is at the same time president of an importing firm and correspondent for Indian papers in this country.

Our second interrogator is James A. Michener, author of *Tales of the South Pacific*, *Return to Paradise*, *The Voice of Asia*, *The Bridges of Toko-Ri*, so I don't really need to say much more about him except of course that the musical, *South Pacific*, was based on his book. I might note he was born in New York and all his books are based on his travels in the East. Mrs. Roosevelt, to start our discussion, what would you like to say first about Asia and your impressions of it?

Mrs. Roosevelt:

I think I would like to say first of all that those who are going to do the questioning really could do the answering much better than I can because they know much more about the East than I know. I very carefully have said that, while I had great opportunities for seeing the countries where I went a year ago I really do not feel that you can gain more than impressions,

Now that is not because I think I was visiting people with inscrutable minds or that there is a basic difference of any kind. I never found that at all.

I can talk just as well to people in India or Japan as I can talk to people in New York, and I have found it just as easy and sometimes more interesting, but my feeling about what I saw was that there were tremendous problems and problems which were difficult for us in the United States to understand because our whole environment and background were very different. One of the things that I keep saying to myself is that we are seeing a country where a part of that country may be having a famine at all times, and it is a little difficult for us to think in terms of people who actually haven't had enough to eat for generations.

I think that is one of the things that strikes you the hardest, that poverty, a land where modern inventions have not brought greater production quickly enough, and great populations bring about problems which are just beginning to be considered with the real intention of solving them. They are just beginning to be considered with hope by the people themselves of those countries because for the first time they are free, and they are able to make their own plans and to carry them out and to get help where they need it. I, of course, had an unusual time in India because I had been invited by Mr. Nehru, and he planned my trip with Chester Bowles.

It happened that at that time, I think, the United States was perhaps more popular in India than she has been for some time, so that I was taken to a great many places and given an opportunity to see a great many things. I think

that it did give me an insight into the problems, and I am very glad that I saw the problems of India quite thoroughly because it helped me see the problems in other countries where I spent less time, and it gave me understanding, I think, which I might have lacked if I hadn't had the opportunities that I had in India to talk to people of real insight, to have them explain things to me. I found that there are really not so many differences. There were just so many more problems than we had to face in our country.

Mr. MacVane: Perhaps we can get down to some specific questioning, Mrs. Roosevelt, and I think perhaps Mr. Singh, as an Indian born, could start.

Mr. Singh:

Mr. Moderator, may I with your permission, sir, make a very brief statement before I ask a question for Mrs. Roosevelt? I know that if there were a percentage of the Pakistan nation present with me on this platform tonight they would agree wholeheartedly with what I am going to say. My remark is made and addressed to Mrs. Roosevelt, and I want to tell Mrs. Roosevelt that in my capacity as the President of the India League of America for years, I have tried to block the trends of unfriendliness that may come up between the people of India and the people of the United States.

I wish to take the opportunity, Mrs. Roosevelt, to tell you that I know of no other person or persons who in such a short time brought better and clearer understanding of the problems of the United States people to India, and the problems of the Indian people to the United States. I wish to say this, that you won the hearts of our people all over that subcontinent, and I would finally add

this, I wish there were one hundred Eleanor Roosevelts. (*Applause*)

Mr. MacVane: Mr. Michener?

Mr. Michener:

I don't want to throw cold water on such a reception, but something Mrs. Roosevelt said did catch my ear. She said that Pandit Nehru had planned her trip. Did that mean, Mrs. Roosevelt, that you saw only what he wanted you to see?

Mrs. Roosevelt: No, not that way. He had talked to Mr. Bowles about what I should see, and then Mr. Bowles added things that he felt were necessary, and Pandit Nehru provided transportation by plane for a good part of this, because otherwise I could never have seen as much. That did not mean that I was not entirely free to stop anywhere when we were in a place, or even to go to places that they had not planned. For instance, I wanted to visit a certain gentleman, who was governor of a province, that I had known in the United Nations, and asked that it be put in the itinerary, and found it very interesting going with him through all his villages. I felt no restriction, but I would of course have been unable to go quite as fast from place to place if it hadn't been made possible for me.

Mr. MacVane: Mr. Singh?

Mr. Singh: The question that I would like to ask Mrs. Roosevelt is this: in many sections of the United States press, and also among very important United States political leaders, India is being dubbed and called, if not Red at least pro-Red, pro-Communist, if not completely Red then a little pink of one shade or another shade. I think you have just given the answer to Mr. Michener that you had the opportunity of seeing a lot of people, not only Prime Min-

ister Nehru, but people of student level, college students, farmers, businessmen, throughout all of your trip, Mrs. Roosevelt, and I would like to ask this question of you, what is your opinion? Are we pink of one kind or another, or not?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, you have asked me a difficult question because, if I were to start with Prime Minister Nehru, I would say that there is no question that he is certainly anti-communist and that he wants to keep India as uncommunist as possible. But what the United States, I think, objects to is a neutralist position, and I think that is largely because we don't understand why that neutralist position is taken. I think I understand it, and I think it is the only one that the Prime Minister could very well take under the circumstances.

However, if you asked me whether I thought communism had had any influence, now the Prime Minister himself told me that he thought that the Hindu religion was so opposed in every way to communism that he had not believed that there could ever be a sowing of the seed of communism in India. But he had found that there were a considerable number of communists in the first election, and they were largely among students and intellectuals. I was asked to speak at a good many universities, and so I would have to say that I was thrown right into the group that was supposed to be the most communist.

Now I found some youngsters who had been indoctrinated, and on one occasion they wrote me an open letter which was the party line from beginning to end, but I have learned since, and it has come very gradually, I sensed then that there was something different

in the understanding of communism in India and the understanding that we have in this country. It became much more clear to me in Japan this year.

I realized that we should make a difference between intellectuals and people who have been brought up on a Marxian ideal and our own knowledge and contact with the Soviets as they are under Stalin and have become under Stalin. That is something very difficult for us to take apart and understand. To a great many people, the ideals of Marxism were preached as something very good, that you weren't going to attain for a long time. It really meant the brotherhood of man and, therefore, when you are not in contact with modern communism and you are not close enough to really understand what the Soviets have done with the old theoretical ideas, you can easily be led away.

I found myself, in Japan this year, talking at complete cross purposes with people because I was talking about the Soviets, as I understand communism today, and they were talking about an idealist theory of Marxism that doesn't exist any more. It was a very interesting lesson to me because I learned again that words can mean quite different things to different people, unless you know what lies back of them. So I would say that in great part the people of India don't really know what communism is, and aren't in the least interested.

But there are, too, students and intellectuals who are frustrated, largely because the education in the universities has been so largely what Great Britain left there, a classical education which is wonderful when you go into the Indian civil service. But now India needs agricultural chemists and en-

gineers and mechanics, and you haven't quite had time to provide all these things for the young people, so you have some frustrated young people coming out of these universities. Those are the ones who accept anything that gives them a hope, and that is, I think, the only answer to your question. You have some people who are bordering on communism or becoming communists, but they are more Marxists than communists.

Mr. MacVane: I think Mr. Michener has a question, Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mr. Michener: Yes, Russia had an agrarian revolution and went communist. China has just had an agrarian revolution and has gone communist. India needs an agrarian revolution, will she, therefore, have to go communist, do you think, in order to attain it?

Mrs. Roosevelt: No, because I think that Mr. Nehru and the leaders have understood the need for a change in the agrarian life. You can see the beginning of the Indian government's effort to change the life of the Indian in the rural areas. After all, India is a rural people still, very largely, and that is where the changes must come most immediately.

Mr. Michener: Do you think America would be wrong, therefore, to interpret all forms of agrarian change in India as communism?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Oh, no, oh, no, those agrarian changes in India are certainly not communist.

Mr. MacVane: Mr. Singh?

Mr. Singh: Is it also not correct, Mrs. Roosevelt, that the changes that came about in Russia and in China came about under the rulers who believed in dictatorship, in hate, in the destruction of the dignity of man, while our leader-

ship, as Prime Minister Nehru said to me the other day, will move toward agrarian reform, but not with that ruthless manner that the communist countries have adopted?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, I think it is very true that people are being treated very differently and that is what makes the difference. The leadership is completely different.

Mr. Michener: Do you think there is *time* for India to accomplish all the changes that she must make?

Mrs. Roosevelt: That really is the question today. Is there time to do the things that need to be done, and that has been the question for some time. And I think perhaps we had the lesson in China, that if you wait for reforms too long, the reforms are going to come the wrong way. I am hopeful that India may have time, because her government does understand that these reforms are necessary and is bending every effort to make the reforms. Now the resources of India are not equal to doing it alone, therefore she needs everything the United Nations can do and everything any other agency can do. The Colombo Plan, our own Point Four, every agency that can be brought to bear on the problem must come together if we are going to do it in time.

Mr. MacVane: Mrs. Roosevelt, you said in your opening remarks that your experience in India had taught you something about the other countries of Asia and the East. Could we perhaps turn the questions to some of these other countries?

Mr. Michener: I have a question about Pakistan, the country that is India's neighbor. Do you think we must choose either India or Pakistan to support with our friendship?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Oh no, oh no, because after all Pakistan and India need each other. They need each other very badly, and good feeling between them. I think both Prime Minister Nehru and the new Prime Minister in Pakistan know that, because they have come together and they are making the first moves to talk things over, and I am very much more hopeful that solutions may be found. Kashmir is not just an emotional question, the problem that really worries Pakistan is the water that rises in Kashmir and that feeds her rivers.

Mr. MacVane: I might just say for the audience's sake that Kashmir is the disputed territory between Pakistan and India.

Mrs. Roosevelt: Yes, I always take that for granted. I remember the first time I looked at the map and realized that the two rivers on which the great dams are being built in Pakistan, which will innovate and create power, both of them rise, one on one side and one on the other, in Kashmir. So it is a very practical question for Pakistan, and I can't help believing that those countries will work it out peacefully.

Mr. MacVane: I think Mr. Singh has a question.

Mr. Singh: It is not exactly a question. I was just going to add that now that Mrs. Roosevelt has mentioned about the rivers that do emanate from Kashmir, the question comes up, if Kashmir goes to India, what will happen to those rivers, and what about the dams, etc.?

I am very glad to inform you, Mrs. Roosevelt, that only today I heard that in the meeting going on in Washington between our engineers, the engineers from India and engineers from Pakistan, with the help of the engineers given over by

the world bank, very satisfactory solutions are being evolved for an internationally agreed upon settlement of the headways of the water, irrespective of what happens to Kashmir, whether it goes to India or Pakistan in the plebiscite.

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, those are the kind of settlements that we are hoping for, which really give hope that people are going to be able to get on together, and I think that is most encouraging.

Mr. MacVane: I think Mr. Michener has a question.

Mr. Michener: When you were in Pakistan, Mrs. Roosevelt, did you find yourself able to get along with people of a Moslem religious background?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Oh, yes, of course I did. It's quite an art. I don't have to have the same religion as my neighbor to get along with my neighbor. I happen to have people living around me in the country who have belonged to many different religions. I don't have to have the same one. I think the important thing is that you really believe in your religion and try to live up to it, that it has an effect upon your life. It isn't necessary that we all have the same one.

Mr. Singh: Is it also not correct that all religions teach us the same things?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Very much.

Mr. MacVane: What about the other areas of that part of the world, Mrs. Roosevelt? You haven't mentioned the Arab countries or the Far East yet.

Mrs. Roosevelt: I went into three Arab countries before I went into Israel and then I went into Israel through Jerusalem, and this question that is asked is one, of course, that is often brought up between Israel and the Arabs, but after all they lived for many years

side by side quite peacefully. It is possible for the Jews and Arabs to live peacefully.

The difficulty has arisen since Israel became a state, an independent state, and I kept being asked in the Arab countries why I had upheld the report which divided Palestine, and I said quite frankly each time that I had upheld it because I thought that when Mr. Balfour promised a homeland he actually meant that someday there should be a homeland, and a homeland to me meant a government of your own. I don't think that was very satisfactory to the Arab countries but they accepted the fact that I was being honest.

Mr. MacVane: Each week we invite our listeners to submit questions which they would like to hear discussed by the speakers. This week Mr. R. Ridgely Lytle of New York City will receive a handsome twenty-volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia for sending us his question relative to tonight's subject. Mr. Lytle's question is: "What chance has India under Nehru to succeed in its apparent effort to play the role of neutral peacemaker between the Communist world and the West?" Mrs. Roosevelt, and of course if our interrogators would like to come in on that we would be delighted.

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, I think, Mr. Michener, you might say what you think first.

Mr. Michener: We often forget that India is a nation of 365 million people. India doesn't have to beg anybody's pardon for wanting to play any role that it wants to. India is a far larger nation than ours. The day may come in history when it will be a more important and powerful nation than ours. She doesn't have to beg our pardon. The point is that India feels that her interests would

be better served by not aligning herself with either Russia or the United States and serving as the leader of a bloc of Moslem, Arab, Hindu nations, working out their own destiny. This does not mean that India is anti-American or that she is pro-Russian. I myself don't find this attitude in India particularly heartening because I think she should be pro-democratic. I do believe that the differences between her point of view and ours can be modified in peaceful terms. I respect India's desire to serve as a third force.

Mrs. Roosevelt: I wonder if I could say that I don't think that Prime Minister Nehru is thinking only of serving his own country's best interests. I do think, of course, every leader of a country has an obligation to think about the interests of his own country, but I have a very great belief that Prime Minister Nehru thinks that what he is trying to do will best serve the world. Now that is neither Russia nor the United States, but the world. I feel as you do, Mr. Michener, that I would like to hear him say that he is on the democratic side, but I think that is because I would like to have my own assurance boosted that we are always right. I am not quite sure we always are right and therefore perhaps it is just as well to have someone who will sit and think on both sides.

Mr. Singh: Mr. Michener says that India should be pro-democratic. My answer is we are pro-democratic. We are a working democracy, a struggling democracy just as the United States is a working democracy and a struggling democracy, and I think this idea that Prime Minister Nehru wants to play some superman role in bringing about peace, and all that, is rather exaggerated in the minds

of the people in this country and otherwise. I think what we insist on, and I think that is true of Pakistan, of Indonesia, of Burma, of Ceylon and other Asian countries, is that we strongly resent decisions being made about Asia and Asian people by the Western Nations without paying any heed to the wishes and the sentiments of the Asian people.

Mr. MacVane: There's one thing, Mrs. Roosevelt, that we haven't yet discussed, and that is the attitude of the United States in the recent UN General Assembly toward India. That made a great deal of news in our papers and on our radios—the opposition of the United States to India's taking part in the Korean peace conference. Can you say anything at all about that?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Yes, our delegation felt very strongly, and of course the State Department must have felt very strongly, that the Korean discussion, peace conference, should be held to questions just on Korea and how that was to be made a peaceful area, and they felt therefore that only such nations as had fought in Korea should be present at this conference. Therefore they opposed India or any other nation that had not had troops actually fighting for the UN in Korea being at the conference.

They felt that the conference should be not a round-table discussing the whole question of peace in Asia but two sides of the table with two opposing groups facing each other. Now it just happens that I have listened with great care because I felt very strongly that it was impossible to solve the questions of Korea without touching on questions of Asia as a whole, and that if we were

going to touch on questions of Asia as a whole, certainly India with 350 million people *had* to be included and it had to be a round-table conference and not two opposing sides facing each other.

But I have listened with great care to all the explanations and all the opinions; I do not find myself convinced. I am still regretful that we are going to try to bring

about a peaceful settlement in Korea, which I think can only be a very limited settlement and will require almost immediately a continuation of consideration of Asiatic problems, because unless that happens I do not see how we can keep peace in Asia.

Mr. MacVane: Now we have some questions from our studio audience. First to Mrs. Roosevelt.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Questioner: Mrs. Roosevelt, I would like to know why India rather than China is always referred to as a third world force.

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, I suppose because China is now a communist country and therefore it is no longer a third force; it belongs to the communist group.

Questioner: Mrs. Roosevelt, did you sense any dislike of or hostility toward Americans in India?

Mrs. Roosevelt: When I was there I sensed none except on very rare occasions when I thought communist-inspired feeling had brought about certain questions, but primarily against me—not against Americans as a whole.

Questioner: Mr. Singh, what are the voting requirements in India, is there a literacy requirement?

Mr. Singh: There is no literacy requirement; it is the complete adult suffrage vote under which the last elections, the first, were held, and you will be interested to know—you being a woman as a questioner—that more women took part in our elections than they do in the United States of America.

Questioner: Mr. Singh, is India likely to adopt a socialist economy?

Mr. Singh: No, I don't see any chances of India adopting—now if you call it socialist economy, we will have to spend half an hour finding out exactly what that means—but if you were talking in terms of mixed economy, then I think India is already having mixed economy, meaning the sodium enterprises which the private enterprises cannot handle are being handled by the government, and certain enterprises that can be handled by the private capital are being handled by that. I don't think that for any appreciable length of time, in my opinion, would we go into complete planned economy if that is what you meant by socialist economy.

Mr. MacVane: Here is a question for Mr. Michener.

Questioner: Don't you think economic and technical aid is a better way to stop empty stomach communism in the Far East than naked brutal military force?

Mr. Michener: One of the things I have been proudest of as an American citizen traveling in Asia is the work of our technical men who are sharing with underprivileged parts of the world our knowledge, our tools, our machinery, our medicine, our knowledge

of education, our doctors and our teachers. I am very proud that we as a nation on all levels have been able to go out and do good works among other people, and I think this will be a lasting memory throughout Asia. We make mistakes, but the goodness will remain.

Questioner: Mrs. Roosevelt, do you believe that in order to negotiate successfully with Communist China we should first recognize its existence as a nation?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Well, I don't think we can negotiate unless we accept the fact that it is a nation, and we have done that already. We have recognized the fact that it exists as a nation.

Mr. MacVane: And another question for you, Mrs. Roosevelt.

Questioner: Mrs. Roosevelt, is the inspirational source of adherence to Marx's principles by the students in India, the student body itself, or the staffs of the universities, or what?

Mrs. Roosevelt: I think it is a mixture. I think certain intellectuals have clung to a theory which they thought was an idealistic theory and that always has an influence. Anything idealistic will have an influence on young people, and I think it is a mixture.

Questioner: Mrs. Roosevelt, did you encounter concern on the part of Indians concerning their countrymen who had emigrated to Africa?

Mrs. Roosevelt: Oh, yes, of course. India is very much concerned about the situation in Africa, as you would know if you had been in the United Nations, because they have spoken on the subject and offered resolutions on the subject.

Mr. MacVane: Mrs. Roosevelt, another question.

Questioner: May I ask to what extent the natives of the countries which we seek to help by our Point Four program are used in that work? It would seem the native's knowledge of his people would be vitally important once he is skilled in the field he has set to work in.

Mrs. Roosevelt: Oh, there is no question that natives are always used, because our Point Four program actually does not function as an American undertaking. The plans are made by the state that wishes to have a program and then we only put in technicians and people of that kind to see that certain things that they want and that we have decided are necessary are carried out.

Questioner: Mr. Singh, will the strong religious feelings of the Indians serve as a sufficiently strong deterrent to the influx of communism there—that is, what is the practical answer that communism is getting?

Mr. Singh: In my opinion, the practical answer to communism that India has given and other free Asian countries are giving is the *nationalism* in those countries. We have become free recently and we threw away the yoke of a foreigner and we have no intention of taking the yoke of another foreigner. Russians are not Indians, Chinese are not Indians. We do not take the yoke of any other foreign ideology or foreign people. Therefore because we have now become free, I think it is the nationalism in India, in Indonesia, in Pakistan which is really the bulwark against the spread of communism in all those parts of Southeast Asia.

Mr. MacVane: Thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt, and thank you, Mr. Singh and Mr. Michener, for your most informative discussion.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

1. Have India and Pakistan proved themselves viable nations?
 - a. To what extent have they achieved internal political stability? Evaluate the quality of their political leaders.
 - b. Have they made significant progress in working out their economic problems?
 - c. Is any attempt being made to cope with the severe population pressures?
2. Evaluate the present state of Indian-Pakistani relations with regard to Kashmir, control of waterways, evacuee property, etc. Does agreement between both countries regarding a plebiscite in Kashmir foreshadow the general easing of tensions on the subcontinent?

ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES

1. Has the U. S. support of the new state of Israel alienated the Arab countries?
2. To what extent are the fears of territorial ambitions on both sides justified?
3. What compromises are necessary to the establishment of harmonious relations between Israel and the Arab states?
4. The U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa recently found both Israel and the Arab states have failed to accept their share of responsibility in solving the refugee problem. Do you agree?

INDONESIA

1. Is it true that Communist influence has been steadily increasing in Indonesia? If so, what is responsible for this trend?
2. Has the present Indonesian government been strong enough to effect needed reforms and provide dynamic leadership?

ASIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

1. Are these areas aware of their strategic importance both to the Soviet Union and the Western powers?
2. Can Asian and Middle Eastern nations remain neutral in the Cold War or must they choose sides? In their determination to be completely free of Western domination, have they needlessly flirted with Communism?
3. Has Communist influence and philosophy made significant inroads in India, Pakistan, Indonesia and the Middle East?

- a. Is Communist propaganda responsible for the growing hostility toward the West?
- b. Or, is the growth of nationalism a more potent anti-Western force?
4. Are these states capable of bearing the responsibilities of national independence?
 - a. Can they defend their own independence against outside aggression?
 - b. Can they maintain law and order within their own boundaries?
 - c. Can they take the necessary steps to improve the welfare of their own people?
 - d. Can they bear their share of international responsibility and fulfill their international commitments?
5. What can these nations do to protect themselves from outside domination?
 - a. Have they enough leadership, strength and resources within the areas concerned? Or, is outside help in the form of economic and military aid a necessity?
 - b. Which is more important to their independence—the development of a military base, or the stabilization of internal conditions?
6. How do you explain the ambivalence of some of these countries toward the Point Four program?
 - a. Do they fear that acceptance of Western aid commits them to political support of the Western bloc in the Cold War?
 - b. Do they regard such aid as an attempt to dominate them or to buy their good will?
 - c. Would the administration of technical assistance by the United Nations be more acceptable?

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

1. To what extent has U. S. prestige declined in India, Pakistan, Indonesia and the Middle East?
2. Are we associated in Eastern minds with their former European masters?
 - a. How can we more closely associate ourselves with our allies in Europe and at the same time disassociate ourselves from their colonial past in Asia and the Middle East?
 - b. Has the United States had a positive and consistent foreign policy in these areas?
 - c. Have we allowed British, French and Dutch interests to dictate our action or inaction?
3. Must the U. S. be prepared to accept "neutralism" as an Asian and Middle Eastern attitude for years to come?
4. Should the U. S. urge these nations to accept our aid when they seem reluctant? Or, should we wait until such aid is requested?
- Is there always a danger that a policy of non-interference in this respect will be misconstrued as indifference?

6. A recent State Dept. pamphlet entitled INDIA—A PATTERN FOR DEMOCRACY IN ASIA, referred to India as the crucial proving ground for freedom for all Asia. Do you agree?
7. Was the United States wise in opposing Indian participation in the Korean parley?
8. What type of action must the U. S. take to secure the good will of Asia and the Middle East?
 - a. Can the U. S. rely on material and economic succor to win the confidence of these areas?
 - b. Or, must it recognize and understand the non-economic aspirations of their peoples?
 - c. Have we fully exploited the propaganda value of our own former colonial status, our fostering of Philippine independence, and our speedy reaction to aggression in Korea?



THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

(Continued from page 2)

Later he attended Swarthmore College, then studied and traveled for two years in Europe. Back in America he became a teacher, followed by a position as associate editor of Macmillan publishers. With the outbreak of World War II he enlisted in the Navy. Out of his wartime experience in the Solomons came *Tales of the South Pacific* (Pulitzer Prize, 1947), which was adapted into the fabulous musical *South Pacific* by Rodgers, Logan & Hammerstein in 1949. During the year of 1950 he returned to the South Pacific to collect material for his book *Return To Paradise. The Voice of Asia* and *The Bridges of Toko-Ri*, which were published in 1951 and 1953 respectively, also grew out of Mr. Michener's extensive travels.

Interrogator—SIRDAR J. J. SINGH—President of the India League of America. J. J. Singh, lecturer and author, spearheaded the movement in the United States for India's freedom. Born of Sikh parents in Punjab Province, India, Mr. Singh studied at Khalsa College, India, and took post-graduate work in London, England. He is now president of the India League of America, and was formerly a member of the All-India Congress Committee. He was founder and first President of the India Chamber of Commerce of America, Inc., and formerly vice-president of the Indian Merchants' Association in London. Mr. Singh came to the United States in 1926 to operate India's concession at Philadelphia's Sesquicentennial Exposition. He stayed in America and is now president of Singh, Singh & Co., importing house in New York, Toronto and London, and of India Arts and Crafts, Inc. Mr. Singh is special correspondent for the *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi; *Tribune Lahore*; and *Hindustan Standard, Calcutta*.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 18

22. Is Today's Prosperity Real?
23. What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?
24. Eisenhower Or Stevenson?
25. What May We Expect from Our New President?
26. Should the Communist Party Be Outlawed?
27. What Is the Answer in Korea?
28. For Better Government: Mayor or City Manager?
29. Have We Weakened the True Meaning of Christmas?
30. What Are the Answers from Korea?
31. Has Creativeness in American Literature Declined?
32. Does Television Enrich American Home Life?
33. What Does Freedom of Speech Mean Today?
34. How Should We Fight Russia's "Hate America" Campaign?
35. Do We Overemphasize the Value of Competition in America?
36. Should Congress Liberalize Our Foreign Trade Policy?
37. Can We Hold the Western Powers Together?

38. Which Way for a Better America?
39. How Can We Convince the World of Our Belief in Brotherhood?
40. Is the United Nations the World's Best Hope for Peace?
41. How Can We Strengthen the Canadian-U. S. Partnership?
42. Who Should Judge the Fitness of Our College Teachers?
43. Should Tidelands Oil Be Returned to the States?
44. Is World Government a Realistic Goal?
45. U. S. Editors Report on Europe and the Middle East.
46. What Would a Korean Peace Mean?
47. What Should We Do With the American Communist?
48. Are Our Immigration Laws Too Restrictive?

VOLUME 19

1. Can We Afford a "Trade, Not Aid" Policy?
2. Are We Losing Our Moral Courage?
3. World Leadership and the Merchant Marine.

Order single copies at 25c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 25c